DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 295 EC 013 101

AUTHOR	Christner, Catherine A.; And Others
TITLE	Evaluation Design: ESEA Title I Migrant Program. Publication No. 81.09.
INSTITUTION	Austin Independent School District, Tex. Office of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	52p.; For a related document, see EC 196 604. Paper copy not available due to small print size.
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Ancillary School Services; *Data Collection; Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluation Needs; Federal Aid; *Information Dissemination; Information Sources; *Migrant Education; Migrant Health Services; Needs Assessment; Parent Participation; Preschool Education; Program Design; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Austin Independent School District TX; *ESEA Title I Migrant Programs; Migrant Student Record Transfer System

ABSTRACT

Evaluation of the 1981-82 Title I Migrant Program in the Austin, Texas Independent School District involved production of a Final Report and a Technical Report which present information relevant to the decision questions; production of an Annual Evaluation Report for the Texas Education Association which documents the extent to which program objectives have been achieved; and dissemination of evaluation information to district personnel throughout the year by means of brochures, memos, and meetings. The evaluation design, contained in this document, is a 1-year plan of evaluation work for the project. Chapter I presents names of persons who have been provided portions of the design for review and comment. Chapter II describes the project and related evaluation activities. Chapter III states all the decision questions and relates them to the evaluation questions and objectives and to their data sources. Chapter IV specifies information needs not included in the previous section. Chapter V specifies the medium for information dissemination, date of distribution, and persons receiving the information. Chapter VI lists each information source, population from which obtained, date of collection, and analysis techniques. Chapter VII is a timeline for data collection. Chapter VIII summarizes all evaluation work estimates by position for each aspect. (CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED211295

Research

and

Evaluation

EVALUATION DESIGN

ESEA Title I Migrant Program

Fall, 1981

Austin Independent

School District

Texas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Freda Holley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RC013101

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Evaluator:
Catherine A. Christner, Ph.D.

Senior Evaluator:
Glynn Ligon, Ph.D.

Data Analyst:
Anna Beeson

Secretary:
Leonila González

EVALUATION DESIGN

ESEA Title I Migrant Program

Fall, 1981

Approved:

Freda M. Holley, Ph.D.
Director, Research and Evaluation

Publication No. 81.09

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND DISCLAIMER

The project present or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

81.09

Evaluation Design ABSTRACT

Title: EVALUATION DESIGN: ESEA Title I Migrant Program Fall, 1981

Contact Persons: Catherine Christner, Glynn Ligon

No. Pages: 27

Content:

The evaluation design is a one-year plan of evaluation work for the project. The table of contents for this document includes:

I. Evaluation Design Review Form	This chapter presents the names and/or signatures of persons (responsible for some aspect of the project's implementation) who have been provided relevant portions of the design for review and comment.
II. Narrative Summary A. Program Summary B. Evaluation Summary	This chapter briefly describes the project and the evaluation activities tied to the project.
III. Decision Questions A. Questions Addressed B. Overview	Here the evaluator states all the decision questions and relates them to the evaluation questions and objectives as well as their data sources.
IV. Information Needs A. Needs B. Overview	Here the evaluator specifies other information needs that are not included in the decision question section. This may include information required for annual TEA reports, applications, interim reports, etc.
V. Dissemination	Here the evaluator specifies the medium by which information will be disseminated, the date of distribution, and the persons receiving the information.
VI. Information Sources	The evaluator lists each information source and specifies the population from which information will be obtained. The date the information will be collected and the analysis techniques are listed as well.

VII.	Data to be Collected in the Schools	This is a timeline for the collection of data in the schools.
VIII.	Evaluation Time Resources Allocation Summary	This chapter summarizes all the evaluation work estimates (in person-days) by position, for each aspect of the evaluation.

Evaluation Design Summary:

Evaluation of the 1981- 82 Title I Migrant Program involves three major activities:

a) The production of a Final Report and a Technical Report which present information relevant to the decision questions.

b) The production of an Annual Evaluation Report for TEA which documents the extent to which program objectives have been achieved.

c) The dissemination of evaluation information to district personnel throughout the year by means of brochures, memos, meetings, etc.

Scope of Design:

5 Decision Questions
32 Evaluation Questions
19 Information Need Questions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract 1

Table of Contents. iii

Program Staff. iv

I. Evaluation Design Review Form. 1

II. Narrative Summary
A. Program Summary. 2
B. Evaluation Summary 5

III. Decision Questions
A. Questions Addressed. 6
B. Overview 7

IV. Information Needs
A. Needs. 15
B. Overview 17

V. Dissemination. 21

VI. Information Sources Summary. 22

VII. Data to be Collected in the Schools. 25

VIII. Evaluation Time Resources Allocation 26

PROGRAM STAFF

The following Austin Independent School District staff members are responsible for the implementation of the Title I Migrant Program.

Lee Laws
Director, Federal and State Applications and Compliance

Oscar Cantú
Administrator, Title I/Title I Migrant

José Mata
Coordinator, Secondary Migrant Education

Kathleen Bryan, R.N.
Family Nurse Practitioner

Eva Barron
Community/Parental Involvement Specialist

Anita Uphaus
Early Childhood Coordinator

Timy Baranoff, Ph.D.
Director, Elementary Curriculum

Ruth MacAllister
Assistant Superintendent,
Elementary Education

W. David Hill, Ph.D.
Acting Assistant Superintendent,
Secondary Education

J. M. Richard
Director, Secondary School Management

Maud Sims
Director, Secondary School Curriculum

Hermelinda Rodriguez
Director, Elementary School Management

EVALUATION DESIGN REVIEW FORM

The following persons have been provided an opportunity to review and to make comments on pertinent sections of this design:

John Ellis, Ph.D.
Superintendent

James Jeffery, Ph.D.
Associate Superintendent,
Operations

Lawrence Buford
Acting Associate Superintendent,
Instruction

W. David Hill, Ph.D.
Acting Assistant Superintendent,
Secondary Education

Ruth MacAllister
Assistant Superintendent,
Elementary Education

Maud Sims
Director, Secondary School
Curriculum

Timy Baranoff, Ph.D.
Director, Elementary School
Curriculum

J. M. Richard
Director, Secondary School
Management

Hermelinda Rodriguez
Director, Elementary School
Management

Hobart Gaines, Ph.D.
Special Assistant for School and
Community Relations

Mauro Reyna
Director, Pupil Services

Lee Laws
Director, Federal and State
Applications and Compliance

Oscar Cantú
Title I/Title I Migrant
Administrator

José Mata
Secondary Migrant Education

Eva Barron
Community/Parental Involvement
Specialist

Anita Uphaus
Coordinator, Early Childhood
Education

Kathleen Bryan, R.N.
Migrant Program Family Nurse
Practitioner

Ann Cunningham
ESAA Administrator

Ann Neeley
Title I Instructional Coordinator

Alicia Martinez
Title I Instructional Coordinator

Kathryn Stone
Title I Instructional Coordinator

Mike Lehr
Executive Director of Personnel

Jetta Todaro
Special Assistant, Administrative
Services

II A

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The Title I Migrant Program is a federally-funded project in the Austin Independent School District. It is designed to meet the unique needs of the District's Migrant Program students. Funds to aid in the education of Migrant Program students are made available to the states based on the number of students who are identified within each state. The Texas Education Agency then allocates the Texas funds to local districts based on district need and program quality. Both *currently migratory* and *formerly migratory* children may be served by the Migrant Program. A *currently migratory* child is one (a) whose parent or guardian is a migratory agricultural worker or migratory fisher, and (b) who has moved within the past 12 months from one school district to another to enable the child, the child's guardian, or a member of the child's immediate family to obtain temporary or seasonal employment in an agricultural or fishing activity. The term "agricultural activity" means "any activity related to crop production (including the preparation of soil and the storing, curing, canning, or freezing of crops); any activity related to the production and processing of milk, poultry, and livestock (for human consumption); and any operation involved in forest nurseries and fish farms." Students retain their currently migratory status for one year following their arrival in the school district. Students who remain in the district following their year of current eligibility are considered *formerly migratory* students (with the concurrence of the parents) for a period of five years. Currently and formerly migratory students are eligible for the same program services.

The level of funding for the Migrant Program in 1980-81 was $1,021,594. For the 1981-82 school year, the funding level is $898,040. This decrease is due to budget cuts.

The activities of the Migrant Program are centered around:

- recruitment of students and parental involvement
- an instructional program for prekindergarten through high school students
- health support services

Recruitment and Parental Involvement

In order to be eligible for the services provided by the Migrant Program, the parents (guardians) of the student have to complete a Certificate of Eligibility/Identification. In signing this form, the parents certify that their children meet the definition of Migrant Program students. Students who are already certified with an Eligibility/Identification Form on file are eligible for services as formerly migratory students without filing another form. Using the previous year's list of Migrant Program students and other community and school contacts, the community representatives begin making home visits to register currently migratory students prior to the beginning of the school year. These home visits continue throughout the year as new Migrant Program students are located and identified. When the Eligibility/Identification Forms are completed, they are sent by the MSRTS clerk to the Region XIII Education Service Center for entry into the MSRTS data bank in Little Rock, Arkansas.

The Migrant Program is also required by federal guidelines to establish Parent Advisory Councils (PACs). In AISD, there is a local campus PAC established at each elementary Title I/Migrant or Migrant campus and an Elementary Districtwide PAC established for the District as a whole. There is a Secondary Districtwide Migrant PAC established for all parents of Migrant Program students attending secondary schools. The PACs provide the parents of Migrant Program students and other community members with an opportunity to learn more about the Migrant Program. PACs also allow parents to advise the District in its operation of the Migrant Program and in planning for future Migrant Program activities. The establishing of the Districtwide and local campus PACs is the responsibility of the Austin Independent School District and its staff members.

Prekindergarten: The Migrant Program has nine prekindergarten classes. The prekindergarten program is for students who are four years old as of September 1, 1981. For 1981-82 two of the classes are funded 50% by Title I Migrant and 50% by Title I. These two split-funded classes are at Allan and Ridgetop. The other classes are located at Allison, Brooke, Dawson, Metz, Ortega, Sanchez, and St. Elmo. Each of the nine classes has one teacher and no aides. Pre-K classes at Metz, Brooke, and Dawson are housed in portable buildings built with ESEA Title I Migrant funds.

Grades K-6: The Migrant Program funds teachers at 10 elementary campuses. Several of the elementary teachers are funded 50% by the Migrant Program and 50% by either Title I or State Compensatory Education. This funding was instituted to better provide services to more Migrant Program students. The teachers serve the following campuses: Allan - Grades 1-3; Becker - Grades K-6; Brooke (teacher funded 50% Migrant/50% Title I) - Grades K, 4-6; Cook (half-time teacher is funded 100% Migrant) - Grades 4-6; Dawson - Grades K-6; Govalle - Grades K-3; Highland Park - Grades 1-3; Metz (teacher funded 50% Migrant/50% Title I) - Grades K-3; Webb (teacher funded 50% Migrant/50% State Compensatory Education) - Grades 4-6; and Zavala (teacher funded 50% Migrant/50% Title I) - Grades K, 4-6. The instructional emphasis will be a supplementary Oral/Written Communication Skills program in coordination with the regular instructional program.

In addition, at Allan, Brooke, Govalle, Metz, and Zavala, a Math Rainbow Kit will be pilot tested on Migrant and Title I students. The Rainbow Kit is a program where materials are sent home for parents to engage in instructional activities with their children.

Grades 7-12: There are seven teachers funded at the secondary level. One teacher serves both Crockett High School (60% of the time) and Porter Junior High School (40% of the time). In addition there is a Migrant Program teacher at each of the following campuses: Fulmore Junior High School (teacher funded 60% Migrant/40% District funds); Martin Junior High School; O. Henry Junior High School (teacher funded 80% Migrant/20% District funds); Anderson High School; Johnston High School, and Travis High School. The instructional emphasis at Grades 7-12 will be Communication Skills.

Migrant Program students who attend campuses without a Migrant Program teacher may be served by other compensatory programs.

Health Services:

The Migrant Program provides health benefits to Migrant Program students who are in need of them. To receive these benefits, the Migrant Program students must meet the low-income criterion (be eligible for the free or reduced lunch program). The Family Nurse Practitioner employed by the Migrant Program screens and examines Migrant Program students and makes referrals to physicians and dentists as needed. Funds from the Migrant Program are used to purchase glasses or to pay medical, dental, or lab fees when other resources are not available.

IIB

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The evaluation of the Migrant Program for 1981-82 focuses on the production of the following:

- Final Report Summary and its related Final Technical Report which present information relevant to the decision questions outlined in this document; and
- As Annual Evaluation Report for the Texas Education Agency (TEA) which documents the extent to which program objectives have been achieved.
- Needs assessment information which provides the Migrant Program staff with information for planning and implementing the program as well provides the basis for the 1982-83 Title I Migrant Application for Funding.

These activities require the collection of needs assessment, process, and outcome data.

Needs assessment data will be gathered in order to determine the number of students eligible for Migrant Program services, their locations, and their achievement levels.

Process data will be used to analyze the extent and efficiency with which program components have been implemented. Data in this category include interviews with the Migrant Program staff, Migrant Program Teacher questionnaire, PAC records, health services records, etc.

Outcome data will indicate the extent to which the Migrant Program has had an impact on the achievement of students. The measures used will be the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, and the Sequential Tests of Educational Progress.

III A
DECISION QUESTIONS ADDRESSED

D1. Should the Pre-K Instructional Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?

D2. Should the K-12 Instructional Component (Communication Skills) be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?

D3. Should the Health Services Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?

D4. Should the Parental Involvement Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?

D5. Should the MSRTS Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

81.09

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
D1. Should the Prekindergarten Instructional Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?	July, August 1982	July, 1982	D1-1. Were the achievement objectives met?	a) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
			D1-2. How do the pre/posttest gains made by the migrant pre-K students on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test compare with the Title I and Title VII pre-K students?	a) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
			D1-3. How do the pre/posttest gains made by migrant and Title I pre-K students this year compare with gains made in 1980-81? With gains made by Title I pre-K students in 1979-80?	a) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
			D1-4. What have been the long-term effects of participation in the Migrant Pre-K Component on migrant students' achievement?	a) Pre-K Longitudinal File
			D1-5. How many pre-K students did Migrant teachers serve?	
			a) What number and percent of eligible pre-K students received services from a Migrant teacher?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			b) What was the average number of pre-K students seen daily by a Migrant teacher during each six-week period?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

81.09

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
D1. (continued)			D1-5. (continued)	
			c) What was the average number of pre-K students served by a Migrant teacher during each six-weeks period?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			d) What was the average number of days of instruction received by pre-K students during each six-weeks period?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			D1-6. How successful was the implementation of the Pre-K Component?	
			a) What concerns/strengths were identified by Migrant teachers?	a) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire
			b) What concerns/strengths were identified by Migrant Program staff?	a) Migrant Staff Interview
			c) How has the reorganization of the AISD Central Administrative staff affected the implementation of the Pre-K Component?	a) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire b) Migrant Staff Interview
			D1-7. Facing possible continuing reduction of funds, what program options exist at the	a) Information Assessment (Multiple sources, e.g. regulations, options used and considered in the past, staff ideas, etc.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
			D1-7. (continued) prekindergarten level?	
D2. Should the K-12 Instructional Component (Communication Skills) be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?	July, August 1982	July, 1982	D2-1. Were the achievement objectives met?	
			a) Kindergarten	a) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
			b) Grades 1-8	b) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
			c) Grades 9-12	c) Sequential Tests of Educational Progress
			D2-2. How do the gains made this year by migrant students in grades 1-12 compare with the gains made in 1980-81?	a) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills b) Sequential Tests of Educational Progress
			D2-3. What have been the long-term effects of participation in the Migrant K-12 Instructional Component on migrant students' achievement?	a) K-12 Longitudinal File
			D2-4. How many K-12 students did Migrant teachers serve?	
			a) What number and percent of eligible K-12 students received services from a Migrant teacher?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			b) What was the average number of K-12 students	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form

31.09

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

81.09

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
D2. (continued)			D2-4. (continued)	
			seen daily by a Migrant teacher during each six-week period?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			c) What was the average number of K-12 students served by a Migrant teacher during each six-week period?	a) Migrant Student Attendnace Form
			d) What was the average number of days of instruction received by K-12 students during each six-week period?	a) Migrant Student Attendance Form
			D2-5. How successful was the implementation of the K-12 Component?	
			a) What concerns/strengths were identified by Migrant teachers?	a) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire
			b) What concerns/strengths were identified by Migrant Program staff?	a) Migrant Staff Interview
			c) How has reorganization of the AISD Central Administrative staff affected the implementation of the K-12 Component?	a) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire b) Migrant Staff Interview

10

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
D2. (continued)			D2-6. What number and percent of students eligible for Migrant services received supplementary instruction from another source?	a) Student Master File b) Migrant Student Master File
			D2-7. Did the math achievement gains of the Math Rainbow Kit participants exceed those of non-participants in the control group?	a) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
			D2-8. What strengths/concerns did the Migrant teachers note re: the implementation of the Math Rainbow Kit?	a) Rainbow Kit Teacher Questionnaire
			D2-9. What strengths/concerns did the Rainbow Kit parents note about the implementation of the Math Rainbow Kit?	a) Rainbow Kit Parent Questionnaire
			D2-10. How was the 9th-12th grade Migrant Instructional Program implemented?	a) Secondary Teacher Activity Record
			D2-11. Facing possible continuing reduction of funds, what program opions exist for the K-12 Instructional Component?	a) Information Assessment (Multiple sources, e.g. regulations, options used and considered in the past, staff ideas, etc.)
D3. Should the Health Services Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?	July, August 1982	July, 1982	D3-1. Were the Component's objectives met?	a) Migrant Health Services Form b) Migrant Medical Expenses Form
			D3-2. What services did migrant students receive?	a) Migrant Health Services Form b) Migrant Medical Expenses Form

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
			D3-3. How many migrant students (by grade and ethnicity) were served by the Migrant Nurse?	a) Migrant Health Services Form b) Migrant Medical Expenses Form
			D3-4. How successful was the implementation of the Health Services Component?	
			a) What concerns/strengths were identified by Migrant teachers?	a) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire
			b) What concerns/strengths were identified by Migrant Program staff.	a) Migrant Staff Interview
			D3-5. Facing possible continuing reduction of funds, what program options exist for the Health Services Component?	a) Information Assessment (Multiple sources, e.g. regulations, options used and considered in the past, staff ideas, etc.)
D4. Should the Parental Involvement Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?	July, August 1982	July, 1982	D4-1. Were the Component's objectives met?	a) Districtwide PAC and Local PAC Records b) Migrant Staff Interview
			D4-2. How many Districtwide and local PAC meetings and training sessions were held between August 1, 1981 and April 30, 1982?	a) Districtwide PAC and Local PAC Records
			D4-3. Did more migrant parents attend local and Districtwide PAC meetings and training sessions during 1981-82 than	a) Districtwide PAC and Local PAC Records

81.09

12

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

81.09

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
D4. (continued)			D4-3. (continued) they did during 1980-81?	
			D4-4. How successful was the implementation of the Parental Involvement Component?	
			a) What problems/strengths can be noted as a result of separating the Districtwide PAC into two PACs - Elementary and Secondary	a) Migrant Staff Interview b) Districtwide PAC Records
			b) How has the reorganization of the AISD Central Administrative staff affected the implementation of the Parental Involvement Component?	a) Migrant Staff Interview
			c) What concerns/strengths were identified by Migrant teachers?	a) Migrant Teacher Questionnaire
			d) What concerns/strengths were identified by Migrant Program staff?	a) Migrant Staff Interview
			D4-5. How do Migrant Program parents want to be involved in the Migrant Program?	a) Migrant Program Parent Survey

13

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III B
DECISION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

81.09

DECISION QUESTION	DECISION DATE	DATE NEEDED	RELEVANT EVALUATION QUESTIONS & OBJECTIVES	INFORMATION SOURCES
			D4-6. Facing possible continuing reduction of funds, what program options exist for the Parental Involvement Component?	a) Information Assessment (Multiple sources, e.g. regulations, options used and considered in the past, staff ideas, etc.)
D5. Should the MSRTS Component be continued as it is, modified, or deleted?	July, August 1981	July, 1981	D5-1. Were the Component's objectives met?	a) MSRTS Records b) Migrant Staff Interview
			D5-2. How successful was the implementation of the MSRTS Component (including SIS)?	
			a) What concerns/strengths were identified by Migrant Program teachers?	a) Migrant Teacher Questionnnaire
			b) What concerns/strengths were identified by Migrant Program staff?	b) Migrant Staff Interview
			D5-3. Facing possible continuing reduction of funds, what program options exist for the MSRTS Component?	a) Information Assessment (Multiple sources, e.g. regulations, options used and considered in the past, staff ideas, etc.)

14

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IV A

INFORMATION NEEDS

A. Needs Assessment

I1. How many Migrant Program students will be enrolled in each school (by grade) in the 1981-82 academic year?

I2. What is the achievement level of the Migrant Program students by school and by grade? How many students at each grade level are at the A achievement level (achievement test score is at or above the 50th percentile), B achievement level (achievement test score is from the 49th percentile to the 31st percentile) and C achievement level (achievement test score is the 30th percentile or below)?

I3. What compensatory programs serve Migrant Program students at each grade for each school; how many migrant students are served by each?

I4. What health needs have been identified for the Migrant Program students?

B. Program Application

I5. How will the objectives in each of the components be evaluated?

I6. What are the proposed objectives for the 1982-83 Evaluation Component?

I7. What is the proposed budget for the 1982-83 Evaluation Component?

C. Texas Education Agency Annual Evaluation Report, 1981-82 and Summer of 1982

Regular Term

I8. How many Migrant Program students (by grade and by ethnicity) received either instructional or health services through the Migrant Program?

I9. How many Migrant Program students (by grade) received instructional services through the Migrant Program?

I10. How many Migrant Program students (by grade), served by the Migrant Program Instructional Component, have pre- and posttest achievement scores (grades 2-12 only)?

I11. What was the pretest normal curve equivalent mean score average (by grade - for grades 2-12) for the Migrant Program students pre- and posttested?

I12. What was the posttest normal curve equivalent mean score average (by grade - for grades 2-12) for the Migrant Program students pre- and posttested?

I13. What was the average normal curve equivalent gain (by grade - for grades 2-12) for the Migrant Program students pre- and posttested?

I14. How many Migrant Program students received health services?

I15. How many Migrant Program students received medical care paid for with Migrant Program funds?

I16. How many Migrant Program students received dental care paid for with Migrant Program funds?

I17. How many Migrant Program parents were involved?

Summer Term

I18. How many Migrant Program students (by ethnicity) received instructional services?

I19. How many Migrant Program students received health services?

INFORMATION NEEDS OVERVIEW

INFORMATION NEED	DATE NEEDED	INFORMATION SOURCES
A. Needs Assessment		
I1. How many Migrant Program students will be enrolled in each school (by grade) in the 1981-82 academic year?	April, 1982	a) Migrant Student Master File
I2. What is the achievement level of the Migrant Program students by school and by grade? How many students at each grade level are at the A achievement level (achievement test score is at or above the 50th percentile), B achievement level (achievement test score is from the 49th percentile to the 31st percentile) and C achievement level (achievement test score is the 30th percentile or below)?	April, 1982	a) Migrant Student Master File b) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test c) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills d) Sequential Tests of Educational Progress
I3. What compensatory programs serve Migrant Program students at each grade for each school; how many Migrant Pro-Program students are served by each?	April, 1982	a) Overlap Study
I4. What health needs have been identified for the Migrant Program students?	April, 1982	a) Migrant Health Services Form b) Migrant Medical Expenses Form
B. Program Application		
I5. How will the objectives in each of the components be evaluated?	March, 1982	a) 1982-83 Title I Migrant Application Draft
I6. What are the proposed objectives for the 1982-83 Evaluation Component?	March, 1982	a) 1982-83 Title I Migrant Application Draft

INFORMATION NEEDS OVERVIEW

INFORMATION NEED	DATE NEEDED	INFORMATION SOURCES
I7. What is the proposed budget for the 1982-83 Evaluation Component?	March, 1982	a) 1982-83 Title I Migrant Application Draft
C. Texas Education Agency Annual Evaluation Report for 1981-82 and Summer of 1982		
Regular Term	August, 1982	a) Migrant Student Master File
I8. How many Migrant Program students (by grade and by ethnicity) received either instructional or health services through the Migrant Program?		b) Migrant Student Attendance Record c) Migrant Health Services Form d) Migrant Medical Expenses Form
I9. How many Migrant Program students (by grade) received in instructional services through the Migrant Program?	August, 1982	a) Migrant Student Master File b) Migrant Student Attendance Record
I10. How many Migrant Program students (by grade) served by the Migrant Program Instructional Component, have pre- and posttest achievement scores (grades 2-12 only)?	August, 1982	a) Migrant Student Master File b) Migrant Student Attendance Record c) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills d) Sequential Tests of Educational Progress
I11. What was the pretest normal curve equivalent mean score average (by grade - for grades 2-12) for the Migrant Program students pre- and posttested?	August, 1982	a) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills b) Sequential Tests of Educational Progress
I12. What was the posttest normal curve equivalent mean score average (by	August, 1982	a) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills

INFORMATION NEEDS OVERVIEW

INFORMATION NEED	DATE NEEDED	INFORMATION SOURCES
grade - for grades 2-12) for the Migrant Program students pre- and posttested?		b) Sequential Tests of Educational Progress
I13. What was the average normal curve equivalent gain (by grade - for grades 2-12) for the Migrant Program students pre- and posttested?	August, 1982	a) Iowa Tests of Basic Skills b) Sequential Tests of Educational Progress
I14. How many Migrant Program students received health services?	August, 1982	a) Migrant Student Master File b) Migrant Health Services Form
I15. How many Migrant Program students received medical care paid for with Migrant Program funds?	August, 1982	a) Migrant Student Master File b) Migrant Health Services Form
I16. How many Migrant Program students received dental care paid for with Migrant Program funds?	August, 1982	a) Migrant Medical Expenses Form
I17. How many Migrant Program parents were involved?	August, 1982	a) Migrant Student Master File b) PAC Records c) Migrant Student Attendance Record
Summer Term		
I18. How many Migrant Program students (by ethnicity) received instructional services?	August, 1982	a) Migrant Student Master File b) Summer School Records

IV B

INFORMATION NEEDS OVERVIEW

81.09

INFORMATION NEED	DATE NEEDED	INFORMATION SOURCES
I19. How many Migrant Program students received health services?	August, 1982	a) Migrant Health Services Form b) Migrant Medical Expenses Form

20

V

DISSEMINATION

INFORMATION	DISSEMINATION FORMAT	DATE	PERSONS RECEIVING
Evaluation Findings for 1980-81	a) Texas Education Agency Final Report	August, 1981	Texas Education Agency-Migrant Program and Evaluation staff
	b) Handouts	August, September 1981	AISD Migrant Program staff (includes teachers and their principals), Community Representatives, and Districtwide PAC parents
	c) Presentations	August - September	Title I and Migrant teachers, AISD Parental Involvement staff, District personnel and Districtwide PAC parents
Evaluation Design, 1981-82	a) Outline of evaluation questions and data to be collected	September, October 1981	AISD Cabinet and other AISD staff including Dept. of Applications and Compliance staff
Interim Findings	a) Needs Assessment/ Program Application	April, 1982	Dept. of Applications and Compliance staff and other interested AISD staff
	b) Informative memos, presentations, reports (as appropriate)	throughout the 1981-82 school year	various AISD staff - especially Migrant Program staff (includes teachers and their principals)
Overlap of Compensatory Programs	a) Overlap Study	Spring, 1982	AISD staff
Evaluation Findings for 1981-82	a) Final Report	June,1982	AISD staff
	b) Technical Report	June,1982	AISD staff

VI
INFORMATION SOURCES

INFORMATION SOURCE	POPULATION	EVAL. QUES. REFERENCED	DATE COLLECTED	ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	REMARKS
1. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	All Migrant Program Prekindergarten students.	D1-1, D1-2, D1-3. I2.	Oct., 1981 April, 1982	Descriptive statistics Analysis of covariance Frequency counts	Test is individually administered to each student.
2. Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	All Migrant Program students in grades K-8.	D2-1, D2-2, D2-7. I2, I10, I11, I12, I13.	Sept., 1981 (K only) Feb., 1982 (7,8) April, 1982 (K-6	Frequency counts Descriptive statistics NCE calculations	Data collected by System-wide Testing
3. Sequential Tests of Educational Progress	All Migrant Program students in grades 9-12.	D2-1, D2-2. I2, I10, I11, I12, and I13.	April, 1982	Frequency counts Descriptive statistics NCE calculations	Data collected by System-wide Testing
4. Prekindergarten Longitudinal File	Achievement data on former Migrant Program pre-K students.	D1-4.	April, 1982	Descriptive statistics Regression analyses Other analyses to be determined	
5. K-12 Longitudinal File	Achievement data on Migrant Program students served over the last four years.	D2-3.	April, 1982	Descriptive statistics Regression analyses Other analyses to be determined	
6. Migrant Student Master File	All Migrant Program students.	D2-6. I1-14, I8, I9, I14, I18, I19.	Continuous	Frequency counts Descriptive statistics	
7. Migrant Student Attendance Record	All Migrant Program students served by a Migrant Program teacher.	D1-5 and D2-4. I3, I8, I9, I17, I18.	August, 1981 through May, 1982	Frequency distributions by six-weeks periods Comparisons by grade and by type of instruction	
8. Secondary Teacher Activity Record	All Migrant Program High School Teachers.	D2-10.	Oct., 1981 - Dec., 1981	Frequency counts Descriptive statistics	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VI
INFORMATION SOURCES

INFORMATION SOURCE	POPULATION	EVAL. QUES. REFERENCED	DATE COLLECTED	ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	REMARKS
9. Migrant Teacher Questionnaire	All Migrant Program Teachers	D1-6, D2-5, D3-4, D4-4, and D5-2	March, 1982	Frequency counts Content coding	
10. Rainbow Kit Teacher Questionnaire	All Migrant Program/Title I teachers in the Math Rainbow Kit Project.	D2-8.	March, 1982	Frequency counts Content coding	
11. Rainbow Kit Parent Questionnaire	Parents of Migrant Program and Title I children receiving Math Rainbow Kits.	D2-9.	Jan., 1981 March, 1982	Frequency counts Content coding	
12. Migrant Program Parent Survey	Sample of Migrant Program Parents.	D4-5.	November, 1981	Frequency counts Content coding	
13. Migrant Staff Interview	Migrant Program Nurse, Migrant Program Administrator Migrant Program Coordinator Early Childhood Coordinator Parental Involvement Specialist, and Migrant Community Representatives.	D1-6, D2-5, D3-4 D4-1, D4-4, D5-1 D5-2.	Jan. 1982 Feb., 1982	Content coding	
14. Migrant Health Services Form	All Migrant Program students served by the Migrant Program Nurse.	D3-1, D3-2, D3-3, I4, I8, I14, I19.	August, 1981 - June, 1982	By-month frequency summary Totals frequency counts	
15. Migrant Medical Expenses Form	All Migrant Program students for whom medical/dental expenses were paid by Migrant Program funds.	D3-1, D3-2, D3-3, I15, I16.	August, 1981 - June, 1982	By-month frequency summary Totals frequency counts	
16. PAC Records	Not applicable.	D4-1, D4-2, D4-3 D4-4. I17.	August, 1981 - June, 1982	Inspection Frequency counts	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VI
INFORMATION SOURCES

INFORMATION SOURCE	POPULATION	EVAL. QUES. REFERENCED	DATE COLLECTED	ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	REMARKS
17. MSRTS Records	Not applicable.	D5-1.	on-going	Inspection Frequency counts	
18. Information Assessment	Not applicable.	D1-7, D2-11, D3-5, D4-6, D5-3	on-going	Not applicable	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VII

DATA TO BE COLLECTED IN THE SCHOOLS

A. Students

October, 1981
April, 1982

1. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test:
Administered to all Migrant Program pre-K students.

B. Teachers

March, 1982

1. Migrant Program Teacher Questionnaire:
The questionnaires will be sent to all Migrant Program teachers. It will take 10 to 20 minutes to complete.

March, 1982

2. Rainbow Kit Teacher Questionnaire:
The questionnaire will be given to the Migrant Program/Title I teachers responsible for distributing the Math Rainbow Kit. It will take 5 to 10 minutes to complete.

August, 1981 -
May, 1982

3. Migrant Student Attendance Forms:
To be complete daily by the Migrant Program teachers and returned to the Migrant Program Evaluator at the end of each six-weeks period.

October, 1981 -
December, 1981

4. Secondary Teacher Activity Record
Observations will be conducted of the high school Migrant Program teachers.

C. Parents

November, 1981

1. Migrant Program Parent Survey
This survey will be sent to a sample of Migrant Program parents (at the same time a similar Title I parent survey is being conducted).

January, 1982 -
March, 1982

2. Rainbow Kit Parent Questionnaire:
These questionnaires will be distributed twice to parents. The distribution and collection will be done by participant's teachers.

VIII

EVALUATION TIME RESOURCES ALLOCATION

81.09

ACTIVITY	DIRECTOR	SENIOR EVALUATOR	EVALUATOR	PROGRAMMER	EVALUATION ASSISTANT	SECRETARY
A. *Design*	.1	.5	5	-	-	4
B. *Information Sources*						
1. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	-	1	15	15	-	15
2. Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	-	1	10	19	-	2
3. Sequential Tests of Educational Progress	-	1	5	4	-	2
4. Prekindergarten Longitudinal File	-	1	5	10	-	1
5. K-12 Longitudinal File	-	1	5	10	-	1
6. Migrant Student Master File	-	1	22	75	-	25
7. Migrant Student Attendance Record	-	1	11	34	-	10
8. Secondary Teacher Activity Record	-	2	10	22	-	9
9. Migrant Teacher Questionnaire	-	.5	1.5	-	-	1
10. Rainbow Kit Teacher Questionnaire	-	.25	1	-	-	1
11. Rainbow Kit Parent Questionnaire	-	.25	2	13	-	1
12. Migrant Program Parent Survey	-	.25	1	-	-	1
13. Migrant Staff Interview	-	.25	3	-	-	2
14. Migrant Health Services Form	-	.25	3	10	-	4
15. Migrant Medical Expenses	-	.25	1.5	3	-	2

26

VIII

EVALUATION TIME RESOURCES ALLOCATION

81.09

ACTIVITY	DIRECTOR	SENIOR EVALUATOR	EVALUATOR	PROGRAMMER	EVALUATION ASSISTANT	SECRETARY
16. PAC Records	-	-	2	-	-	2
17. MSRTS Records	-	-	2	-	-	2
18. Information Assessment	-	2	5	-	-	5
Subtotal of Information Sources	-	13	-	215	-	-
C. *Dissemination*						
1. TEA Report (1981-82) (includes summer school)	.1	.5	5	-	-	1
2. Handouts	.1	.5	1	-	-	2
3. Needs Assessment, Program Application (inc. Amendments)	.1	.5	10	-	-	2
4. Final Report	.1	.5	2	-	-	2
5. Other Dissemination (mtgs., etc.)	.1	.5	2	-	-	1
Subtotal of Dissemination	.5	2.5	20	-	-	8
D. *Technical Report*	1	5	60	-	-	60
E. *Administrative and Other Indirect Time Costs*	.5	10	40	15	-	60
Total	2	31	230	230	-	230

27

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Will D. Davis, President

Nan Clayton, Vice President

Manuel Navarro, Secretary

Steve M. Ferguson

Peter W. Werner, M. D.

Ed Small

Jerry Nugent

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Dr. John Ellis

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Dr. Freda M. Holley